

REMARKS

Claims 5-14 remain in the application. Claims 1-4 and 15-25 have been canceled.

In the final Office Action mailed October 24, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 15-17, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,831,566 (“Ginetti”). Claims 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Ginetti in view of applicant’s admitted prior art. Claims 20-23 were rejected as obvious over Ginetti in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,844,515 (“Park”).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s basis for the rejection of claims 1-4 and 15-25.

In the remarks accompanying the rejection, the Examiner attempts to map Ginetti to the claimed invention. However, even if one were to accept the Examiner’s characterization that Ginetti shows a selection circuit (transistors 130) and a deselection circuit (again the transistors 130), Ginetti does not show or suggest the deselection circuit utilizing a single selected output of the selection circuit to deactivate nonselected outputs (which the Examiner identifies as nodes N0-N5) by forcing the same to a reference potential.

Ginetti teaches that at a minimum two of the nodes are activated at a time (column 4, lines 50-55) and in another embodiment multiple nodes are activated (column 5, lines 32-39). Thus, Ginetti does not activate a single selected node. While Ginetti does describe turning off nonselected switches in one embodiment (column 5, lines 33-39), there is no description or suggestion of using a single selected output for this purpose. It is clear that Ginetti cannot perform the claimed method (claim 4) because it does not have the claimed structure, *i.e.*, a plurality of outputs, a deselection circuit that utilizes the single selected output to deactivate nonselected outputs by forcing the same to a reference potential.

Thus, while applicant has canceled the rejected claims, applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims by way of continuation application utilizing the arguments set forth above. Cancellation of these claims is thus in no way an admission that they are obvious or anticipated by the references cited by the Examiner.

In view of the fact that claims 5-14 have been found allowable, applicant respectfully submits that these claims remaining in this application are now in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/E. Russell Tarleton/
E. Russell Tarleton
Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jl

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

943260_1.DOC